

**DOCKET NO: 246008US2** 

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

HIDEKI SHOJI : EXAMINER: TIBBITS, P. F.

SERIAL NO: 10/721,464

FILED: NOVEMBER 26, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2838

FOR: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

CONFIRMING THE CHARGE AMOUNT AND DEGRADATION

STATE OF A BATTERY, A STORAGE MEDIUM, AN

INFORMATION PROCESSING

APPARATUS, AND AN

**ELECTRONIC APPARATUS** 

## PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Election of Species Requirement mailed December 12, 2005, Applicant provisionally elects, with traverse, Species I, for examination on the merits in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, and 23 are identified as readable on Species I.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Election of Species Requirement because the PTO has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish that searching and examining the claims corresponding to the noted figures would be an undue burden.

In particular, MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Application No. 10/721,464 Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2005

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding Election Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Regarding the objection to Claims 31-42 and 45-78, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection, which is not necessary for further consideration of the elected claims, be held in abeyance until allowable matter is indicated (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b)).

Regarding the statement of the outstanding Office Action that the Information

Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on February 24, 2004, fails to comply with the patent rules

because no concise explanation of the foreign language references has been provided,

Applicant notes that MPEP 609.04(a) III, second full paragraph, states that "[s]ubmission of
an English language abstract of a reference may fulfill the requirement for a concise

explanation." As the IDS filed on February 24, 2004, includes an English language abstract
for each disclosed foreign reference, Applicant respectfully requests the next Office

Communication to initial each disclosed reference as considered and to return to Applicant's
representative the initialed 1449 form.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

GJM/RFF/ys
I:\atty\Rff\246\08\246008\selection.doc

Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599 Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.

Limited Recognition No. L0037